DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 845 CS 501 647

AUTHOR Chesebro, James W.
TITLE A Philosophic Base for Generic Analysis: A Plausible Future for Contemporary Rhetoric.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (New York City, March 24-26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); *Interaction; *Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetoric; *Rhetorical Criticism; Social Environment; *Sociocultural Patterns; Speaking; Theories

ABSTRACT

Traditional conceptions of the scope of rhetoric urge that critics attend to certain mechanisms which describe the case study: the perspective of the speaker; orality; the specific situation; civil, ingratiating, and rational strategies; and the speaker's ability to satisfy his or her own ends. Contemporary rhetoricians offer a broader base for rhetorical theory which includes the analysis of all symbolic forms that contribute to and convey meanings in human interactions. This paper argues that the shift in emphasis in rhetorical criticism from a speaker orientation to an assessment of the effect of symbolic forms on the sociocultural system has significant implications for the understanding of rhetorical genre. By expanding the scope of rhetoric, theorists have provided a more comprehensive base for identifying variables affecting generic forms and effects. Guidelines for generic formulations are summarized. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137845

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PHILOSOPHIC BASE FOR GENERIC ANALYSIS:

A PLAUSIBLE FUTURE FOR CONTEMPORARY RHETORIC

James W. Chesebro

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James W. Chesebro

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Paper read at the Eastern Communication Association convention, March 1977

CS 501 647

A PHILOSOPHIC BASE FOR GENERIC ANALYSIS: A PLAUSIBLE FUTURE FOR CONTEMPORARY RHETORIC

We deal, in this program, with the future: particularly, we speculate about the study of human communication. A speculation is a symbolic conception of the future, revealing a perspective toward change, shared or rejected by others. Alvin Toffler has observed that credible speculations are viewed as highly probable, possible, or plausible forecasts of what will be or will not be.[1] Abandoning scientific procedures, the plausible forecast typically emerges from a dramatic view of the future; it asserts and reflects a preference or preferred future. Frequently, fantastic, rich, and complex in form, the portrayal of a plausible future involves asserting the desirability of a particular dynamic relationship among multiple variables. Plausible forecasts are likely to become reality only if creative agents decide to enact the scenario.[2]

The scenario I envision here posits a reemphasis and refashioning of three critical dimensions of contemporary rhetorical theory.[3] First, the new avenues exposed by recent expansions of the concept of rhetoric should be aggressively utilized. Second, the evaluative function of criticism should be reconceived. But these first two recommendations are preparatory steps leading to a third and the central concern of this essay: the explicit presentation of philosophic guidelines for future generic formulations and analyses.

The Scope of Rhetoric--Utilizing a New Perspective

Traditional conceptions of the scope of rhetoric urge that critics focus upon those "things" which are "supplied by the speaker," not "invented" forms such as "witnesses, evidence given under torture, written contracts, and so on."[4] While holding that rhetoric "is not concerned with any special or definite class of subjects,"[5] some theorists have argued that the "point of view" of "rhetorical criticism" is "patently single": "speech" is regarded as the "communication," and critics must "hold" their "business to be the analysis and appreciation" of the

speaker's "method" of imparting the ideas in his speech to his hearers."[6] Necessarily, "the scheme of a rhetorical study" emphasizes "the speaker's personality as a conditioning factor" and "the leading ideas with which he plied his hearers."[7] In practice, such rhetorical conceptions turned the critical impulse toward the "great speaker," "great speech," and "civility and rationality."[8] Ultimately, these traditional conceptions of the scope of rhetoric have generated mechanisms for the explication of the case study: the perspective emphasizes the particular speaker; orality; the specific situation; civil, ingratiating, and rational strategies; and the speaker's ability to satisfy his own ends.

Contemporary rhetoricians offer "a broader base for rhetorical theory."[9] It is now popular to define this "broader base" by specifying new classes of elements to be included within the scope of rhetoric. We are told that obscenities, demonstrations, aggressive discourses, and physical violence may function as rhetorical forms. Such definitions suggest a supermarket of rhetoric in which a kind of "shopping list" is employed to keep track of the forms used for definition. Questions of definition are frequently examined allegorically. We may be asked to decide if a robber holding a gun to our heads, demanding our money or our lives, is employing a strategy consistent with the range and kinds of options generally held to exist in a rhetorical transaction. Regardless of how we resolve these highly dramatic and allegorical questions, we are seldom left with a shared set of theoretical parameters as a base for perceiving the scope of rhetoric.

Contemporary rhetoricians consider more than orality or speech in defining the scope of rhetoric. The object of study is human communication, particularly the analysis of all symbolic forms contributing to and conveying meanings in human interactions. Environmental factors such as architecture and seating arrangements as well as kinesics, haptics, clothing styles and so forth contribute to an understanding of the functions of a communicative system and the social meanings conveyed in a human transaction. This view of rhetoric implies that orality may exert a minimum role in the study of human communication. Two researchers have argued, in

fact, that 93% of social meanings are conveyed through nonverbal communication.[10] This shift from orality to nonverbal communication requires the rhetorical critic to anticipate that communicative processes and outcomes may not be the product of human intentions. As Kenneth Burke has observed:

> If I had to sum up in one word the difference between the "old" rhetoric and a "new"...., I would reduce it to this: The key term for the old rhetoric was "persuasion" and its stress was upon deliberative design. The key word for the "new" rhetoric would be "identification" which can include a partially "unconscious" factor in appeal.[11]

Contemporary rhetoricians are thus likely to be concerned about any symbolic activity affecting the human condition. I.A. Richards urges that we view rhetoric as the "study of misunderstanding and its remedies."[12] Kenneth Burke recommends that rhetoric be treated as the study of "symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols."[13] Edwin Black suggests that rhetorical criticism must ultimately "enhance the quality of human life."[14]

The diverse and competing symbol systems employed by different groups of agents affect the ways in which the human condition is enacted. The technological and specialization demands of our culture have generated a host of rhetorical systems which, in part, distinguish science, politics, business, education, law, and the arts.[15] The symbolic distinctions among these disciplines reflect the unique perceptual, descriptive, interpretative, and evaluative frameworks required to provide the particular products of each discipline. Each of these symbol systems is capable of affecting the human condition in different ways; each is the province of the contemporary rhetorician. An increasing number of critical efforts should be devoted to the rhetoric of science, political communication, organizational communication, instructional communication, the rhetoric of law, and aesthetic communication.

The Evaluative Function in Rhetorical Criticism--A Reassessment

As contemporary rhetoricians have expanded the scope of rhetoric, concepts and functions within critical analyses have also been transformed. Description, interpretation, and evaluation remain the three interlocking functions of all rhetorical criticism.[16] However, the meanings attributed to these functions have been altered.

Increasing attention has been devoted to the role and function of evaluation in rhetorical criticism.[17]

Traditionally, rhetorical criticism has been conceived as forensic in form and content: it "either attacks or defends someone"[18] as an effective or ineffective speaker; its subject matter is "things already done"[19] or "past" speaking phenomena; it assesses speaking behavior against established norms of effective manipulation.[20] The evaluation of discourses initially involved a careful description and interpretation of the effects of a speaker's address upon a particular audience in a specific situation, and a determination of the speaker's objectives in addressing that audience. The critic then offered an evaluation, a judgment, regarding the degree to which a speaker did or did not achieve his desires for speaking. The fulfillment of the speaker's desires is central in these analyses, suggesting that traditional rhetorical criticism is speaker-oriented. The evaluative judgment rendered is not unlike the verdict a judge must provide at the end of a legal proceeding: "Was the speaker effective or ineffective, given the circumstances of and the potential for success in the particular case?"

While granting that all criticism is a comparison between actuality and potentiality, contemporary rhetoricians are more likely to reject "'suasory potential or persuasive effects'" as the base for the comparison.[21] They are more likely to conceive of criticism as epideictic in content and form. As Walter Fisher has put it, "the essence of criticism is the qualitative judgment."[22]

> The natural province of criticism is praise and dispraise rather than guilt and innocence. And the functions of criticism are in line with those of epideictic discourse: to educate men to excellence, celebrate it, and provide 'wise counsel for the state.'"[23]

The shift from forensics to epideictics produces significant changes in the substance of rhetorical criticism. The emphasis is shifted from the speaker's ability to satisfy personal needs to the effects that discourse exerts upon the potential for "understanding," "cooperation," and the "quality of life" within the sociocultural system. Nilsen reflects the position adopted by contemporary rhetoricians:

> The concern about results...has been primarily with the results the speaker intended to achieve. From the standpoint of the speaker these are, to be sure, the most important. From the standpoint of the society upon which the speech has its impact they may not be the most important and probably often are not....Certainly the effects a speech has are more important to society than the effects it was or is intended to have.[24]

Sociocultural evaluations, by rhetorical critics, require multiple qualitative judgments. Such evaluations are essential if a comprehensive assessment of a symbolic form is to be provided. All communicative acts--interjected into the public domain--emerge from, reflect, and argue for one set of value judgments rather than another.[25] The qualitative judgments guiding symbol users affect meanings. The value judgments embedded in communicative acts must be assessed relatively or comparatively if the more profound meanings of the symbolic act are to be understood. As Ewbank and Ewbank argue,

> Rhetorical artifacts have philosophical, aesthetic, and ethical dimensions. The rhetorical critic must evaluate each of these dimensions as it is manifest in the rhetorical product and in the choices made by the rhetor as that product was created because...it seems critically significant to ask, not what the effects of the discourse were, but rather what part the discourse played...in the rhetorical transaction.[26]

As we look to the future, an increasing number of contemporary rhetoricians should be rendering such sociocultural assessments of symbolic efforts. We see the prototypes now. In "The Second Persona," for example, Edwin Black argues that the rhetoric of the radical right "is not one that a reasonable man would freely choose, and he would not choose it because it does not compensate him with either prudential efficacy or spiritual solace for the anguished exactions it demands."[27] The sociocultural consequences of rhetorical forms cannot, of course, be thoughtfully assessed without direct attention to the philosophic issues related to value systems. The concept of rhetorical axiologies provides a potential base for reasonable assessments of the philosophic implications of qualitative evaluations in rhetorical criticism.[28] More extensive attention should be given to rhetorical axiologies.

Generic Forms and Generic Effects

I have underscored two major ways in which contemporary rhetoric is affecting

how human communication is studied. First, contemporary rhetoricians are expanding the scope of rhetoric from a solely oral and single speaker orientation to the study of all variables affecting meaning. Second, contemporary rhetoricians are shifting the critical mode of evaluation from a speaker orientation to an assessment of the effect of a symbolic form upon the sociocultural system. These two changes are intimately related, and they function as presumptions for the contemporary rhetorician's conception of the rhetorical genre. In this regard, the study of symbolic forms contributes directly to our understanding of generic forms. The study of sociocultural consequences may lead directly to our understanding of generic effects.

By expanding the scope of rhetoric, we are provided with a more comprehensive base for identifying all variables affecting generic forms. When we shift from the study of orality and the single speaker to the study of symbolic forms, we intentionally minimize the particulars of any single communicative interaction; instead we seek to identify discrete patterns among all variables within multiple interactions. A generic orientation or perspective begins to emerge. Rather than conceiving of each human interaction as an esoteric event, generic analyses presume that particular acts serve as examples of archetypes, categories, or groupings.[29] A generic conception of an act should, then, allow the critic to anticipate the ways in which the act will evolve over the course of time, the likely consequences of the act, and the relative value of the act within a sociocultural system. To examine human acts as solitary, esoteric, random, and unpredictable events denies the study of communication as either an enduring art or a reliable science. A generic framework for the study of symbolic forms is thus a more direct and deliberate method for identifying all major variables affecting the modes of arousal and fulfillment existing in multiple situations.

As we reconceive the critical mode of evaluation, we establish a method for identifying generic effects. The concept of generic effects, posited here for the first time, possesses a potentially useful role in a generic approach to the study of human communication. Traditional conceptions of communicative effects are

generally limited to the consequences generated by particular speakers before specific audiences in unique circumstances. The effects described and interpreted under these circumstances may include consequences solely and uniquely produced by the esoteric interaction of the speaker with that audience in that circumstance. Even the most careful assessment of the speaking phenomenon does not allow us to determine which of the effects specified is commonly associated with a particular rhetorical form or is a byproduct of elements tangential to the rhetorical form under investigation. On the other hand, the concept of generic effects applies only to those consequences regularly associated with a rhetorical form, ideally with a high degree of probability and under diverse circumstances. Axiomatically, generic effects become more powerful in an analysis if they (1) can be demonstrated to be associated with a rhetorical form more frequently than other effects, if they (2) repeatedly occur when a rhetorical form is employed in diverse settings, and if they (3) emerge when distinctly unique speakers employ the rhetorical form. For example, we may have reason to assume that two generic effects of the diatribe are its ability to attract attention and to shock or challenge established perceptual expectations. Windt provided a foundation for such a hypothesis about the diatribe as a rhetorical form by examining the use of the form by cynics of the second century and Yippies in the 1960s.[30] Becase the diatribe produced the same effects when employed by distinct kinds of speakers in diverse settings, we may assume that the hypothesis is worthy of investigation. In studying the generic effects of the diatribe we ought, however, to increase the number of cases examined to determine if the diatribe is repeatedly associated with these two effects more than with any other kinds of effects. Nonetheless, the notion itself, that is generic effects, is the issue. In positing such a concept, we attempt to specify those consequences most likely to be associated with particular rhetorical forms. If the concet of generic effects is to possess power, the evaluative function in rhetorical criticism cannot be assessed solely in terms of the speaker's ability to satisfy personal needs. If we are concerned with the identification of generic effects as described

here, it would be more profitable to describe directly the social consequences of a rhetorical form from a societal perspective rather than focus upon the speaker's objectives, for the speaker's objectives may have little, if any, relationship to the significant and enduring objectives of the social system.

Thus, when generic analysis is our concern, two preparatory changes seem to be essential: first, to expand the scope of rhetoric to include all variables affecting meanings; second, to reconceive the concept of a critical evaluation if generic effects are also to be included in our assessments of genres. Implicit in these shifts is a theoretical conception of a rhetorical genre. The generic critic must first specify the essential characteristics of the rhetorical form under investigation, ideally identifying features of the form not shared by other rhetorical forms. Second, the generic critic must specify probable, possible, or plausible generic effects associated with the rhetorical form examined, ideally indicating those generic effects uniquely associated with the rhetorical form. Given the incredibly creative use of symbols which occur whenever humans function, it may not be possible to identify discrete rhetorical genres, but the theoretical concept suggested here forces a critic to specify, as far as possible, the degree to which a form can be said to be discrete and the degree to which it produces discrete effects regardless of circumstances. With this view of genres in mind, philosophic guidelines for generic formulations may now be explored.

Guidelines for Generic Formulations

Generic analyses abound within the discipline. The apologia, diatribe, oxymoron, eulogy, gallows speech, inaugural address, and State of the Union address have been described as generic forms. Moreover, genres have been specified. The argumentative and exhoratative forms have been formally distinguished, and the more commonly employed persuasive tactics--the consensus, confrontation, apologia, and concession strategies--have been cast as discrete generic forms.

Nonetheless, there is dissatisfaction with generic analyses in general; the foundation for generic formulations has not received the kind of explicit attention

and definition required to create a shared universe of understanding. Simons has observe that in formulating generic guidelines, "rhetoricians have operated, if not at cross-purposes, at least with varying purposes, and they have fought pseudobattles over what constitutes a 'true' rhetorical genre."[31] He has further argued that, "the recent profusion of genre studies has not been accompanied by serious efforts at explicating the concept of 'rhetorical genre,' or at devising methods by which types and type-tokens of rhetorical genres may be reliably identified."[32] These concerns have led Simons to propose that generic formulations proceed along certain methodological lines:

> First, there must be a class of genres into which a particular genre can be put....A second requirement for generic identification is that the categorizer must have clear rules or criteria for identifying distinguishing characteristics of a genre, and he must be able to assign consistently items of discourse to generic categories according to those rules. Third, the necessary and sufficient distinguishing features of a genre must not only be nameable but operationalizeable; the categorizer must be able to tell the observer or critic how to know a distinguishing feature when he sees it. Finally, if items of discourse are to be consistently identified as fitting within one genre or another, it follows that these items should be internally homogeneous across salient characteristics and clearly distinguishable from items comprising an alternative genre.[33]

Having provided these guidelines, Simons has deplored the lack of an accompanying set of philosophic and theoretical prescriptions for generic formulations, observing that, "genres 'exist' at various levels of abstraction, from the very broad to the very specific....Surprisingly, there have been only fledgling efforts thus far at evolving a hierarchical schema of rhetorical genres."[34] Similarly, Reid has recently argued that "rhetorical critics utilize a variety of criteria" in "grouping" rhetorical "productions into genres." He has identified the results: "the term, 'rhetorical genre,' is somewhat unclear," "'genre criticism at best has limited usefulness,'" "confusion [exists] regarding 'rhetorical genres,'" and "unfortunately, we lack a neat, comprehensive system for classifying rhetorical appeals."[35] These problems cannot possibly be resolved here. However, as a step toward the elimination of some of these ambiguities, I should like to propose one set of philosophic guidelines for generic formulations.

Philosophic conceptions are immediately fraught with difficulties, for the term philosophy itself can be ambiguous. However, philosophic assessments typically posit one kind of understanding about the nature of reality based upon a synthesis of previous experience; the synthesis itself, not previous experiences, constitute the base for understanding. In this sense, philosophic frameworks are not derived from technical precepts and practical arts nor are they verified through direct observation. As philosophers Paul Edwards and Arthur Pap argued, philsophic constructs are "critical reflections" regarding "universal principles."[36]

Issues related to the philosophy of rhetoric are too often relegated to that small group of scholars who regularly read Philosophy and Rhetoric; but generic formulations benefit markedly from a philosophic perspective. Philosophic classifications schemes minimize cultural influences by ignoring time-space demarcations, which are inherent in most generic groupings and distinctions. Particularly, a philosophic generic framework provides a classification scheme of rhetorical acts which (1) transcend the particular time and circumstances generating the acts while (2) grouping and distinguishing rhetorical acts according to their unique formal characteristics.

The philosophic generic framework examined here is grounded in the theory of dramatism developed by Kenneth Burke, especially his discussion of "significant form" in Counter-Statement and "substance" in A Grammar of Motives. I would suggest a set of generic classes, each simultaneously possessing a central element, characteristic, essence, or substance as well as an identifiable sequence, evolutionary pattern of development, or form. The "substance" and "form" of the class simultaneously define each class as well as distinguish it from all other classes. The ways in which substance and form are treated in this scheme are best examined separately, and then viewed as interrelated concepts.

A generic class may possess one of three substantive characteristics: geometric, familial, or directional.[37] A class of objects can be understood to possess a geometric substance if it derives its identity from a relationship to

other objects. For example, a leader is understood as an entity, because of its geometric relationship to a set of followers. Objects possess a familial substance if they derive their identity from their origins or ancestry. A king, for example, is "divine" by virtue of his heritage. Directional substance stresses the experience of managed or motivated actions (free motion, motivation from within, purposeful intentions). Thus, the rhetoric of "trends" and "contracts" is grounded in a directional essence.

Besides possessing a substantive characteristic, each generic class also gains its identity by virtue of its formal characteristic: a class may be viewed as an embodiment of a syllogistic, qualitative, or repetitive form. Syllogistic progressions are the form "of a perfectly conducted argument, advancing step by step."[38] In a syllogistic form, one incident "naturally" leads to another. In a qualitative form, "the presence of one quality prepares us for the introduction of another"--"one state of mind leads to another."[39] In the repetitive form, one concept or principle is reasserted in multiple guises: "It is restatement of the same thing in different ways."[40]

But while substantive and formal characteristics can be described separately, substance and form function simultaneously to define and to distinguish each of the generic classes in this philosophic scheme. When merged, the three substantive and three formal characteristics generate a three by three grid, creating nine generic classes, as depicted in Figure 1 on page 12.

These nine generic classes may be used by a critic to define and to distinguish rhetorical acts philosophically. A rhetorical act classified into one of these nine classes thus possesses a philosophic base. Other rhetorical acts falling within the same class share, endorse, and reinforce the same philosophic orientation. If rhetorical acts occupy an alternative class, they function as a competing symbolic and philosophic system. Let me offer two examples to illustrate the ways in which two rhetorical acts, classified into different generic classes, function competitively as world views.

Figure 1

Generic Classes

Form	Substance		
	Geometric	Familial	Directional
Syllogistic			
Qualitative			
Repetitive			

We may believe many things about the theories of Sigmund Freud; nonetheless, he developed a set of symbols which have affected the attitudes, beliefs, and actions of people. Of his many theories, the Oedipus complex is central to Freud's symbolic framework. As he put it, "the sense of guilt of mankind as a whole, which is the ultimate source of religion and morality, was acquired in the beginning of history through the Oedipus complex."[41] The relationship between the mother and the son constituted the theory: ancestry (a familial substance) is the characteristic permeating the theory. Moreover, Freud viewed the relationship as a "fixation" and "complex," which leads the critic to identify the repetitive form associated with the theory. Conceived in this fashion, Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex is seen to possess familial and repetitive characteristics as a rhetorical and philosophic act.

In sharp contrast, Charles Darwin developed his theory of natural organic development in On the Origin of Species.[42] Species and their environment constitute a mutually defining relationship in the theory; a geometric relationship is thus assumed to define the species. Moreover, over time, as environmental conditions change, species move through progressive stages of development; the sequence implied here is a syllogistic pattern. Darwin's theory of natural organic development, in this scheme, possesses geometric and syllogistic characteristics.

From a philosophic perspective, the two rhetorical acts differ markedly. Freud described a static world, restricted by ancestry. Darwin, on the other hand, described a dynamic world with change controlled by environment. Freud's conception reveals the ways in which people are prevented from acting as free agents because of an overidentification with other co-agents. Darwin posits a form of materialistic determinism: the world is one of change, but the change is a function of the environment rather than of human agents. Thus, our scheme provides a framework for revealing the philosophic perspective controlling rhetorical acts as well as allowing a critic to explore the ways in which two rhetorical acts may compete as philosophic systems.

Conclusion

Conceptions of the future must be posited cautiously and tentatively. Yet, we must conceive of a future, hopefully a future which stimulates and challenges the discipline. The objective is probably best realized by positing plausible forecasts, forecasts which are enacted only if we choose to do so. Of the many plausible forecasts which can be imagined, the following seem rich and intriguing. First, an investigation should be made of nonverbal communication variables as factors affecting the arousal and fulfillment of communicative sequences. Concomitantly, a grammar and a theory for nonverbal communication should receive even greater attention. Second, systematic research programs should be developed in the areas of the rhetoric of science, political communication, organizational communication, instructional communication and academic rhetoric, the rhetoric of law, and aesthetic communication. Particular attention should be given to the explication of unique forms and unique sociocultural consequences in each of these areas. Third, intensive attention should be devoted to the philosophic, theoretical, and methodological issues embedded in the concepts of a rhetorical genre, generic form, and generic effects. Finally, while offering philosophic and methodological guidelines for generic formulations, attention should also be devoted to the construction of a theoretical structure or framework for investigating the subforms within any philosophic generic class. While efforts are now underway in this area,[43] a theoretical construct should be developed which specifies the kinds of research questions which can be asked about any generic class, outlines ways in which these research questions can be answered, and suggests the possible research bases which could be used in answering the questions. Such a theoretical construct should recognize the range of multiple rhetorical forms which may exist within any generic class.

Mr. Chesebro is Assistant Professor, Department of Speech, Temple University.

[1]Alvin Toffler, "The American Future is Being Bumbled Away," The Futurist, 10 (April, 1976), 100.

[2]Plausible or preferred futures are frequently associated with science fiction and science fantasy. For a description of the scenario created in these approaches to the future, see: Ray Lynn Anderson, Persuasive Functions of Science-Fiction: A Study in the Rhetoric of Science (Ph.D. dissertation: University of Minnesota, 1968).

[3]For a definition of contemporary rhetorical theory and criticism, see: James W. Chesebro and Caroline D. Hamsher, "Contemporary Rhetorical Theory and Criticism: Dimensions of the New Rhetoric, "Speech Monographs, 42 (November 1975), 311-334.

[4]Aristotle, The Rhetoric, i, 1, 1355^{b}, 38-43.

[5]Aristotle, i, 1, 1355^{b}, 35-36.

[6]Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory, " in The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama, ed. by Donald C. Bryant (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), p. 35.

[7]Wichelns, p. 38.

[8]Robert L. Scott and Donald K. Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (February, 1969), 7.

[9]Scott and Smith, 8.

[10]For a more extended discussion of the conclusions reached by Mehrabian and Wiener in this context, see: James C. McCroskey, An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication, second edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 110-111.

[11]Kenneth Burke, "Rhetoric--Old and New," The Journal of General Education, (1951), 203.

[12] I.A. Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 3.

[13] Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of Motives (rpt. 1945 and 1950; Cleveland: Meridan, 1962), p. 567. Burke's emphasis.

[14] Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 9.

[15] Chesebro and Hamsher, 334.

[16] For a more detailed examination of the way in which these terms are employed here, see: James W. Chesebro and Caroline D. Hamsher, "Rhetorical Criticism: A Message-Centered Procedure, "The Speech Teacher, 22 (November 1973), 282-290.

[17] See, for example, Barbara H. Ewbank and Henry L. Ewbank, "The Critical Statement," Central States Speech Journal, 27 (Winter, 1976), 285-294; Walter R. Fisher, "Rhetorical Criticism as Criticism, "Western Speech, 38 (Spring 1974), 75-80; and Wayne Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism and Argument," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60 (April 1974), 165-174.

[18] Aristotle, i, 3, 1358^{b} 11.

[19] Aristotle, i, 3, 1358^{b} 15-17.

[20] Aristotle, i, 3, 1358^{b} 26-34.

[21] Fisher, 75.

[22] Fisher, 75.

[23] Fisher, 77.

[24] Thomas R. Nilsen, "Criticism and Social Consequences," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 42 (April 1956), 175. Nilsen's emphasis.

[25] Gerald R. Miller argues, for example, that "every communicative act involves, of necessity, a value judgment;" see: An Introduction to Speech Communication, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972), p. 10.

[26] Ewbank and Ewbank, 285.

[27]The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (April 1970), 119.

[28]For an excellent summary and conception of axiology in rhetoric, see: Howard Streifford and Craig Smith, "An Axiological Adjunct to Rhetorical Criticism," Speech Communication Association convention, 1975. I offer a summary of the history of axiological examination in rhetoric and a point of view of the use of rhetorical axiologies in "Cultures in Conflict--A Generic and Axiological View," Today's Speech, 21 (Spring 1973), 11-20.

[29]Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement (rpt. 1931; Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1968), p. 124.

[30]Theodore Otto Windt, Jr., "The Diatribe: Last Resort for Protest," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58 (January 1972), 1-14.

[31]Herbert W. Simons, "'Genre-alizing' About Rhetoric: A Scientific Approach," Speech Communication Association convention, December 1976, p. 1.

[32]Herbert W. Simons, "A Conceptual Framework for Identifying Rhetorical Genres," Central States Speech Association convention, April 1975, p. 2.

[33]Simons, "A Conceptual Framework for Identifying Rhetorical Genres," pp. 3-4.

[34]Simons, "A Conceptual Framework for Identifying Rhetorical Genres," p. 3.

[35]Ronald F. Reid, "New England Rhetoric and the French War, 1754-1760; A Case Study in the Rhetoric of War," Communication Monographs, 43 (November 1976), 259-260.

[36]Paul Edwards and Arthur Pap, A Modern Introduction to Philosophy (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), pp. 3-4.

[37]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of Motives (rpt. 1945 and 1950; Cleveland, Meridian, 1962), pp. 29-33.

[38]Burke, Counter-Statement, p. 124.

[39]Burke, Counter-Statement, pp. 124-125.

[40]Burke, Counter-Statement, p. 125.

[41]Sigmund Freud, A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis (rpt. 1920; Garden City, New York: Permabooks, 1953), p. 341.

[42]The most impressive analysis of Darwin as a rhetorical agent is provided by John Angus Campbell; see. "Darwin and The Origin of Species: The Rhetorical Ancestry of an Idea," Speech Monographs, 37 (March 1970), 1-14; and "Charles Darwin and the Crisis of Ecology: A Rhetorical Perspective," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60 (December 1974), 442-449.

[43]See, for example, Simons, "'Genre-alizing' About Rhetoric: A Scientific Approach." I have also conceived of a theoretical construct which would be operative within each of the generic classes described in this paper. The theoretical construct would generate particular research questions by specifying major variables relevant to research hypotheses as well as a range of potential data bases which could be used to answer these research questions. Figure 2 below specifies these variables and data bases.

Figure 2

A Theoretical Construct for Generic Class Analysis

	Variables				
Date Base	Acts	Scene	Agency	Agents	Purpose
Attitudes					
Beliefs					
Ideas					
Values					
Goals					
Ideology					

Burke's conception of the pentad in A Grammar of Motives provides definitions for the variables specified in Figure 2. I have offered distinguishing definitions for the data bases in "Radicals in the 1770s and the 1970s: An Analog of Rhetorical Movements," Speech Communication Association convention, December 1974, pp. 7-8.